

**REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated June 1, 2006, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

**In the Claims:**

Claims 1-7 and 9-30 were previously pending.

Claims 1, 4-5, 9-14, 17-21, 28, and 30 are currently amended.

Please cancel claims 2-3, 6-7, 15-16, and 22-27.

Claims 2-3, 6-8, 15-16, and 22-27 are now canceled.

Claims 1, 4-5, 9-14, 17-21, and 28-30 are currently pending.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

The Office rejects claims 17-18, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,987,480 to Donohue et al.

**Claim 17**

Claim 1, as amended, defines a content template system to assist authoring a web page document, the system including a collection of mark-up language tags to replace using separate web page, style sheet, and template documents that includes:

- a set of markup indicator tags for a web page template, wherein each tag in the set is bound to an associated element behavior;
- a context object to coordinate the element behaviors of the tags;
- wherein the tags link an executing web page to one or more content resources, such that content changes are propagated throughout the one or more content resources and linked panes of the web page.

The Donohue reference, on the other hand, does not show or disclose a collection of mark-up language tags to replace separate web page, style sheet, and template documents that are conventionally used in authoring a web page, and so Donahue does not show or disclose each element of Applicant's amended claim 17. For example, Donahue does not show or disclose a set of markup indicator tags associated with element behaviors and a context object to coordinate the behaviors, wherein the tags are coordinated with each other such that content changes are propagated throughout the one or more content resources and linked panes of the web page.

Since Donahue does not show or disclose each element of Applicant's claim 17, the Applicant requests that the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be removed. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17, as amended, is allowable over Donohue.

**Claims 18, 21**

For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 17, Applicant submits that dependent claims 18 and 21 are also allowable and are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by the Donohue reference. Dependent claims contain the language of the claims from which they depend. Claims 18 and 21 depend from claim 17, therefore these claims should also be allowable.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The Office rejects claims 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Donohue in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,823,359, to Heidingsfeld, et al.

Claims 1-2, 9, 12, 22, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Donohue in view of Esposito (NPL-Element Behaviors in Internet Explorer 5.5, Dec 2000). Of these claims, claim 2 is canceled. This leaves claims 1, 9, 12, and 28 still remaining rejected.

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Klevenz (US Pub 2003/0137540 filed Dec. 26, 2002) in view of Lynch (US Patent No. 6,558,431). However, claim 26 is canceled.

Claims 13-14, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Klevenz and Lynch further in view of Esposito. Of these claims, claim 27 is now canceled. This leaves claims 13-14 still remaining rejected.

1        Claims 3-7, 10-11, 15-16, 23-25 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.  
2        §103(a) as being unpatentable over Donohue in view of Esposito, further in view  
3        of Heidingsfeld. Of these, claims 3, 6-7, 15-16, and 23-25 are now canceled. This  
4        leaves claims 4-5, 10-11, and 29-30 still remaining rejected.

5  
6        **Claims 19 and 20**

7        Applicant submits that claims 19 and 20 are allowable by virtue of their  
8        dependency on base claim 17, which the Applicant suggests is an allowable claim.

9        Additionally, the combination of Donohue and Heidingsfeld does not teach  
10       or suggest a tag or tags programmed to display dynamic updates of (or editing  
11       controls for) converted content in real-time in a web page generated by the web  
12       page template where the tags are coordinated so that content changes are  
13       propagated throughout the one or more content resources and linked panes of the  
14       web page.

15       Applicant respectfully submits that claims 19 and 20 are allowable too.

16  
17       **Claim 1**

18       Amended claim 1 defines a computer-executable method of editing a  
19       web page document and a remote content used by the web page document during a  
20       runtime of the associated web page using a system of mark-up language tags  
21       instead of using separate documents including one or more of a web page  
22       document, a style sheet document, and a web page template document, including:

- 23       • deploying an editor generated by an edit tag within the running web page  
24       document;

- 1  
2 • locating the remote content referenced by a tag of the web page document,  
3 via an element behavior of the tag, wherein the remote content resides in a  
4 database remote from the web page document;  
5
- 6 • converting the remote content via the element behavior into a markup  
7 language used in the web page document, wherein the remote content is of  
8 a compliant format or of a non-compliant format with the format of the  
9 markup language;  
10
- 11 • replacing the tag with the converted content in response to rendering the  
12 web page document;  
13
- 14 • updating the tag in response to using the editor to change the remote  
15 content, by automatically converting the edited remote content via the  
16 element behavior into the markup language; and  
17
- 18 • wherein when multiple tags link an executing web page to one or more  
19 content resources, content changes are propagated throughout the one or  
20 more content resources and linked panes of the web page.  
21

22 Neither Donahue nor Esposito, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all  
23 elements of claim 1. As discussed in the Examiner Interview of August 8, 2006,  
24 the functionality of the element behaviors in Applicant's claims goes beyond that  
25

1 of Donahue and Esposito. Neither Donahue nor Esposito teach or suggest  
2 multiple tags linking an executing web page to one or more content resources,  
3 such that content changes are propagated throughout the one or more content  
4 resources and linked panes of the web page.

5 Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection  
6 be removed from claim 1.

7  
8  
9 **Claims 9, 12, and 28**

10 For reasons similar to those described above for claim 1, neither Donahue  
11 nor Esposito, alone or in combination teach or suggest the elements of claims 9,  
12 12, and 28. Claims 9, 12, and 28 define specific tags and association to remote  
13 content within Applicant's Content Template System. As above, neither Donahue  
14 nor Esposito teach or suggest elements of a system of multiple tags linking an  
15 executing web page to one or more content resources, such that content changes  
16 are propagated throughout the one or more content resources and linked panes of  
17 the web page.

18 Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9, 12, and 28 are  
19 allowable over Donahue and Esposito.

20  
21 **Claims 4-5, 10-11, and 29-30**

22 For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1, 9, 12, and  
23 28, Applicant submits that dependent claims 4-5, 10-11, and 29-30 are also  
24 allowable. Dependent claims contain the language of the claims from which they  
25

1 depend. Claims 4-5 depend from claim 1; claims 10-11 depend from claim 9; and  
2 claims 29-30 depend from claim 28. Therefore these claims should also be  
3 allowable.

4  
5 **Claim 13**

6 Claim 13 defines a computer-executable method to assist authoring a web  
7 page document, the method using a system of mark-up language tags instead of  
8 separate web page, style sheet, and template documents including executing a  
9 preview tag comprising an element behavior for a web page template, including:

- 10
- 11 • reading a reference in the preview tag to at least part of the web page  
12 template to display as a currently executing web page;
  - 13
  - 14 • displaying editing controls defined by the element behavior of the  
15 preview tag; and executing logic to: dynamically update the  
16 currently executing web page to display changes in content, style,  
17 and layout in the part of the web page template referred to by the  
18 reference when the web page template is edited by the editing  
19 controls;
  - 20
  - 21 • wherein the part of the web page template being referenced includes  
22 multiple tags and when multiple tags link an executing web page to  
23 one or more content resources, content changes are propagated  
24  
25

1 throughout the one or more content resources and linked panes of the  
2 web page.

3  
4 Klevenz, Lynch, and Esposito, alone or in combination, do not teach or  
5 suggest the elements of claim 13. For example, none of these references teach or  
6 suggest a preview tag and editing controls defined by an element behavior of the  
7 preview tag with logic to dynamically update the currently executing web page to  
8 display changes in content, style, and layout in the part of the web page template  
9 referred to by the reference when the web page template is edited by the editing  
10 controls wherein the part of the web page template being referenced includes  
11 multiple tags and when multiple tags link an executing web page to one or more  
12 content resources, content changes are propagated throughout the one or more  
13 content resources and linked panes of the web page.

14 Applicant thus suggest that the combination of Klevenz, Lynch, and  
15 Esposito fails, and requests that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection be removed.  
16 Applicant respectfully suggests that claim 13 should be allowable over these cited  
17 references.

18  
19 **Claim 14**

20 For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 13, Applicant  
21 submits that dependent claim 14 is also allowable. Dependent claims contain the  
22 language of the claims from which they depend. Claim 14 depends from claim 13,  
23 therefore claim 14 should also be allowable too.



1  
2 **Conclusion**

3       The Applicant submits that all of the remaining claims are in condition for  
4 allowance and respectfully requests such allowance. The Applicant respectfully  
5 requests that the undersigned attorney be contacted for the purpose of scheduling  
6 an interview if issues remain unresolved.

7  
8                                   Respectfully Submitted,

9  
10       Dated: 09-01-06

By: 

11  
12                                   Mark Farrell  
13                                   Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
14                                   Reg. No. 45,988  
15                                   Attorney for Applicant  
16                                   Telephone: 509-324-9256 x247  
17                                   Facsimile: (509) 323-8979  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25